

problem if the Pentagon is providing special access to retired officers, and then basically using them as pawns to spout the administration's talking points of the day. There are allegations that analysts who failed to deliver the message required by the administration mysteriously lost access to future briefings and information. I find this deeply troubling. We deserve to be able to trust the actions of the Pentagon.

We also deserve a retired officer corps that is worthy of the respect it receives from the American people, who place great faith in their judgment and their loyalty to our Nation. Americans trust our Active Duty and retired military, and rightly so.

I know a number of the retired officers employed by the media as military analysts to be honorable people. But the special access they are alleged to have received and the circumstances of their employment, without proper disclosure of their outside interests or biases, raise a number of uncomfortable questions that deserve serious answers.

Which master do these analysts serve: The United States Government, which supplies their retirement pay? The Pentagon, which may reduce the amount of analysis they actually need to do by providing detailed talking points promoting the current administration's message agenda? The defense contractors, who pay them for serving on boards for their defense expertise and, perhaps more to the point, for their Pentagon connections?

Will their analysis, either by design or just by lucky coincidence, result in contracts or other advantages for the companies from which they take home a paycheck?

Mr. Speaker, it hurts me to my core to think that there are those from the ranks of our retired officers who have decided to cash in and essentially prostitute themselves on the basis of their previous positions with the Department of Defense. I would hate to think that, because a few people have blurred ethical boundaries and cashed in on their former positions, that we might tarnish the military's hard-won reputation for professionalism and objectivity and love of country first and foremost.

Finally, I think our media have a serious responsibility to disclose potential conflicts of interest when they do their reporting. This applies to all of their stories, of course, and not just to those that include retired officer military analysts. I understand that different organizations have different rules, but perhaps it would not be out of order for our journalism schools and professional journalism organizations to develop ethical guidelines for dealing with such issues.

Mr. Speaker, our Nation's military exists to protect America's freedoms for its citizens today and for future generations. The First Amendment guarantees the right of all Americans, including retired servicemembers and members of the press, to speak freely

and without restraint. But with our rights come responsibilities to act honestly and ethically.

I have no doubt we will continue to discuss these matters in the days ahead.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. JONES) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. JONES of North Carolina addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

93RD ANNIVERSARY OF THE ARMENIAN GENOCIDE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. GARRETT) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, today we mark the 93rd anniversary of the onset of the Armenian genocide. It is on this date that the Ottoman officials captured more than 200 Armenian intellectual leaders and placed them in prison. Unfortunately, these actions were only the beginning of the Ottoman-led atrocities against the Armenians.

During the following years, at least 1.5 million Armenians were arrested and compelled to march hundreds of miles to what is today the Syrian desert. And along the way, prisoners of all ages endured hunger, thirst, rape, sexual abuse, and other forms of torture.

While it is difficult for us to commemorate these terrible acts each year, we must continue to remember those horrors that can occur when governments persecute citizens based on ethnicity or religious affiliation.

We often hear those words of George Santayana's famous quote that, "Those who cannot remember the past are condemned to repeat it." And these words are ringing true today as well. Already, there are those who deny that the Armenian genocide occurred despite the vast evidence to the contrary. Meanwhile, our generation has seen its own mass murders occur in Rwanda and Sudan.

So, I urge my colleagues in the majority to bring House Resolution 106, which commemorates these atrocities that occurred only a few generations ago, to the House Floor for a vote. Now is the time for America to officially ensure that U.S. foreign policy reflects sensitivity concerning human rights issues.

Just yesterday, I had the privilege of meeting Alice Khachadoorian-Shnorhokian. Alice is a resident of Mahwah, New Jersey, which is a town in my district. Alice was born in Turkey in 1912 to a successful, respected Armenian family of eight. And when Turkish officials ordered Armenians to denounce their faith and nationality, she and her parents refused. As a re-

sult, her family was rounded up and ordered to march into the desert. Alice and her brother were too young, of course, at that age to walk, so her parents had to put them in boxes on either side of a donkey and march into the desert.

When they arrived in Aintab, her mother befriended their Turkish neighbors, and these neighbors ultimately enabled them to get a permit which allowed Alice and her family to escape. Alice moved to the United States in 1980, and became a citizen of the U.S. just 5 years later. And, as a survivor, she says she wants to, "see justice so that the words 'never again' become a reality."

So, while I am a Member of Congress, I will always remember Alice's words and her wish. We must fully recognize the friendship with our allies in Turkey today, but we cannot change nor should we forget the past. I hope that there can be some reconciliation between Turkey and Armenia, and that a proper acknowledgement of the crimes of the past can now allow them to move forward into a future of peace and also of mutual understanding.

WAR IN IRAQ

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California (Ms. WOOLSEY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Speaker, China is facing growing criticism for its record on human rights. It has been condemned for its recent crackdown on Tibet, its oppression of dissidents at home, and its support for the regime in Sudan that is responsible for the genocide in Darfur.

Russia is another country that has received justifiable criticism for cracking down on freedom. President Putin has rolled back many of the democratic gains Russia made after the Cold War. And the recent elections in Russia were a sham, clearly rigged to favor Putin's candidate.

Because of all of this, you would think that the people of the world would have a much higher opinion of the United States, the world's greatest democracy, than they would have of anti-democratic China and Russia. But that just isn't the case. Incredibly, according to the most recent annual survey of international attitudes, America is viewed more negatively around the world than China and Russia.

The Study of World Opinion was conducted by the BBC World Survey. According to the BBC, America's image abroad plummeted after our invasion of Iraq in the year 2003, and continued to decline in the following years.

The latest survey, which was released on April 1, however, has shown some good news. America's image is a little better than it was last year. But it is not because the world has suddenly changed its opinion about the Bush administration and its policies in Iraq.

The director of the survey was quoted as saying, "It may be that, as